

REMARKS**INTRODUCTION:**

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 9, 16 and 19 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, and claims 8, 14, 18, 20, 25, 26 and 29 have been amended. No new matter is being presented, and approval and entry are respectfully requested.

Claims 8, 10-14, 17-18 and 20-29 are under consideration. Claims 1-7 and 31-35 are withdrawn. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

ENTRY OF RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.116:

Applicants request entry of this Rule 116 Response and Request for Reconsideration because:

(a) at least certain of the rejected claims have been canceled thereby at least reducing the issues for appeal;

(b) it is believed that the amendments of claims 8, 14, 18, 20, 25, 26 and 29 put this application into condition for allowance;

(c) the amendments were not earlier presented because the Applicants believed in good faith that the cited prior art did not disclose the present invention as previously claimed;

(d) the amendments of claims 8, 14, 18, 20, 25, 26 and 29 should not entail any further search by the Examiner since no new features are being added or no new issues are being raised; and/or

(e) the amendments place the application at least into a better form for appeal. No new features or new issues are being raised.

The Manual of Patent Examining Procedures sets forth in §714.12 that "[a]ny amendment that would place the case either in condition for allowance or in better form for appeal may be entered." (Underlining added for emphasis) Moreover, §714.13 sets forth that "[t]he Proposed Amendment should be given sufficient consideration to determine whether the claims are in condition for allowance and/or whether the issues on appeal are simplified." The Manual of Patent Examining Procedures further articulates that the reason for any non-entry should be explained expressly in the Advisory Action.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112:

In the Office Action, at page 2, numbered paragraph 2, claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, for the reasons set forth therein. This rejection is traversed

and reconsideration is requested.

It is respectfully submitted that, as illustrated in FIG. 2, a control unit 202 is coupled to the driving unit 208, which controls the blower 218 in the present invention. As noted in lines 1-2 of page 6 of the specification: "The blower selectively blows relatively high and low pressure air into the chamber 106" (emphasis added). In addition, as noted in lines 15-17 of page 18 of the specification: "The control unit 202 controls the blower 218 and the heater 210, so that the determined temperature and supplying time of the current of warm air are met" (emphasis added). Hence, it is submitted that it is clear to one skilled in the art that the control unit controls the exit ducts from the blower and the rate of blowing such that, when low pressure air is desired, the low pressure exit duct is open, and warm air is blown at a lower pressure (lower blower fan speed), and that, when high pressure air is desired, the blower fan operates at a faster speed and the low pressure exit duct is closed.

However, for clarity, claim 8 has been amended to delete "of first pressure" and "of second pressure." In addition, claim 8 has been amended to include a humidifier, a blower, and a controller controlling the humidifier, the heater, the ozonizer, the ozone disposer, and the blower. Claim 9 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Also, claim 25 has been amended to delete "at a first pressure," and claim 26 has been amended to delete "at a second pressure."

Hence, it is respectfully submitted that the operation of the two ducts in conjunction with the control unit and the drive unit is definite under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103:

A. In the Office Action, at pages 2-3, numbered paragraph 4, claims 8 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hachiman et al. (Japanese patent publication No. 2002-85898; hereafter, Hachiman) in view of Taylor et al. (USPN 6,312,507; hereafter, Taylor) or Sun et al. (USPN 6,447,731; hereafter, Sun) and Watanabe (JP02-087175; hereafter, Watanabe) or Hiromachi (JP 2002-282346; hereafter, Hiromachi). The reasons for the rejection are set forth in the Office Action and therefore not repeated. The rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner has utilized hindsight reasoning, i.e., has utilized the present invention as a blueprint, listed the necessary elements using the blueprint, and then selected FIVE patents, each having an element of the present invention, and combined them to purport to show that the present invention is obvious. It should be noted that the courts have held that such an approach is not acceptable: In Ruiz and Foundation v. A.B. Chance Company, 69 USPQ2d 1690 (CAFC January 29, 2004), the court held:

In making the assessment of differences, section 103 specifically requires consideration of the claimed invention “as a whole.” Inventions typically are new combinations of existing principles or features. Envtl. Designs, Ltd. v. Union Oil Co., 713 F.2d 693, 698 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (noting that “virtually all [inventions] are combinations of old elements.”). The “as a whole” instruction in title 35 prevents evaluation of the invention part by part. **Without this important requirement, an obviousness assessment might break an invention into its component parts (A + B + C), then find a prior art reference containing A, another containing B, and another containing C, and on that basis alone declare the invention obvious. This form of hindsight reasoning, using the invention as a roadmap to find its prior art components, would discount the value of combining various existing features or principles in a new way to achieve a new result – often the very definition of invention.** (emphasis added)

Section 103 precludes this hindsight discounting of the value of new combinations by requiring assessment of the invention as a whole. This court has provided further assurance of an “as a whole” assessment of the invention under § 103 by requiring a showing that an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention, confronted by the same problems as the inventor and with no knowledge of the claimed invention, would select the various elements from the prior art and combine them in the claimed manner. In other words, the examiner or court must show some suggestion or motivation, before the invention itself, to make the new combination. See In re Rouffet, 149 F.3d 1350, 1355-56 (Fed. Cir. 1998). (emphasis added)

The Examiner admits that Hachiman does not show an ozonizer for automatically supplying ozone into the chamber when the detected odor is greater than an odor reference value and an ozone disposer to remove ozone from the air. Hachiman recites a deaeration type drying machine that sucks air.

It is respectfully submitted that Taylor recites (see Abstract): “A hand-holdable electro-kinetic electro-static ionic air refreshener-conditioner for a pet shelter or litter box includes a self-contained ion generator that provides electro-kinetically moved air with ions and safe amounts of ozone” (emphasis added). Hence, it is respectfully submitted that Taylor recites an air refresher-conditioner for a pet litter box or the like and does not recite or suggest:

A clothes dryer, comprising:

a chamber to accommodate clothes;

a first duct to supply air into the chamber;

a second duct to supply air into the chamber;

a heater to heat air supplied through at least one of the first or second

ducts;

an ozonizer to automatically supply ozone into the chamber through at least one of the first or second ducts when an amount of odor of the clothes is

greater than an odor reference value; and

an ozone disposer to selectively remove ozone from air recirculated into the

chamber, (emphasis added)

as is recited in independent claim 8 of the present invention,

or

An apparatus for containing clothes, the apparatus comprising:

a chamber to accommodate clothes;

a heater to generate a current of warm air by heating air supplied into the chamber;

an ozonizer to supply ozone into the chamber;

an ozone disposer to selectively remove ozone from air recirculated into the chamber; and

a control unit to automatically control the heater and the ozonizer to periodically perform a drying function and a deodorizing function according to automatically detected amounts of moisture and odor, respectively, of the clothes, (emphasis added) as is recited in independent claim 13 of the present invention.

Hence, it is respectfully submitted that there is no recitation or suggestion of combining Taylor with Hachiman, and even if combined, the pet-litter box air refreshener conditioner-deaeration drying machine does not recite or suggest the present claimed invention.

It is respectfully submitted that Sun recites (see col. 1, lines 4-8 of Sun): "The present invention relates to **a cleaning device which can be connected with a personal computer to serve as an environmental quality monitoring system which is able to automatically judge and adjust indoor air quality**, and give more information for a user" (emphasis added). Hence, it is respectfully submitted that Sun recites an air quality adjustment system which is attachable to a computer and does not recite or suggest:

A clothes dryer, comprising:

a chamber to accommodate clothes;

a first duct to supply air into the chamber;

a second duct to supply air into the chamber;

a heater to heat air supplied through at least one of the first or second ducts;

an ozonizer to automatically supply ozone into the chamber through at least one of the first or second ducts **when an amount of odor of the clothes is greater than an odor reference value**; and

an ozone disposer to selectively remove ozone from air recirculated into the chamber, (emphasis added)

as is recited in independent claim 8 of the present invention,

or

An apparatus for containing clothes, the apparatus comprising:

a chamber to accommodate clothes;

a heater to generate a current of warm air by heating air supplied into the chamber;

an ozonizer to supply ozone into the chamber;

an ozone disposer to selectively remove ozone from air recirculated into the chamber; and

a control unit to automatically control the heater and the ozonizer to periodically perform a drying function and a deodorizing function according to automatically detected amounts of moisture and odor, respectively, of the clothes, (emphasis added) as is recited in independent claim 13 of the present invention.

Hence, it is respectfully submitted that there is no recitation or suggestion of combining Sun with Hachiman, and even if combined, the personal computer cleaning device-deaeration drying machine does not recite or suggest the present claimed invention.

It is respectfully submitted that Watanabe recites (see (57) Abstract and BASIC ABSTRACT): a unit having an ozone filter wherein the unit is **"Used in electrophotographic image forming units including printers, copying machines, or facsimiles"** (emphasis added). Hence, it is respectfully submitted that Watanabe recites an ozone filter for image forming units and does not recite or suggest:

A clothes dryer, comprising:

a chamber to accommodate clothes;

a first duct to supply air into the chamber;

a second duct to supply air into the chamber;

a heater to heat air supplied through at least one of the first or second ducts;

an ozonizer to automatically supply ozone into the chamber through at least one of the first or second ducts **when an amount of odor of the clothes is greater than an odor reference value;** and

an ozone disposer to selectively remove ozone from air recirculated into the chamber, (emphasis added)

as is recited in independent claim 8 of the present invention,

or

An apparatus for containing clothes, **the apparatus comprising:**

a chamber to accommodate clothes;

a heater to generate a current of warm air by heating air supplied into the chamber;

an ozonizer to supply ozone into the chamber;

an ozone disposer to selectively remove ozone from air recirculated into the chamber; and

a control unit to automatically control the heater and the ozonizer to periodically perform a drying function and a deodorizing function according to automatically detected amounts of moisture and odor, respectively, of the clothes, (emphasis added) as is recited in independent claim 13 of the present invention.

Hence, it is respectfully submitted that there is no recitation or suggestion of combining Watanabe with Hachiman, and even if combined, the unit having an ozone filter used in an electrophotographic image forming unit-deaeration drying machine does not recite or suggest the present claimed invention.

It is respectfully submitted that Hiromachi recites a pneumatic sterilization device (see CORRECTION OR AMENDMENT, February 12, 2003, a copy of which is included herewith for the Examiner's convenience): "[Claim 1] From some receipt objects which sterilize air, air is incorporated and the inside of the "sterilization tank" (drawing 5 -19) of the following conditions and a "sterilization wind tunnel" (drawing 5 -20) is passed for the incorporated air. The inactivation of the virus in air, Sterilization, dust removing, odor removal, etc. are performed and it is the air pasteurizer of structure which returns to the room the air which it was humidified in the case of dry air, and resulted in the last "finishing wind tunnel" (drawing 5 -20), and superfluous waterdrop and superfluous surplus ozone were removed, and was purified with the ozone air current of optimum dose further. The conditions in a sterilization tank and a sterilization wind tunnel are the environments which gestalt-ized ozone to some. The air to which opening of the opening of the air which drew in with inhalation opening first is carried out in the shower cylinder of the water surface (drawing 51) where the air bubbles containing ozone have exploded and which passed through the shower cylinder further passes the multistage type ozone water network (drawing 7) which passes the environment where ozone gas and an ozone water droplet are flying, and is always further washed with ozone water, and measures air, ozone water, and mixed contact. It results in a "finishing wind tunnel" (drawing 43) after that, and by passing a waterdrop prehension filter (drawing 54), an ozone reduction filter (drawing 52, 3), etc., superfluous moisture and surplus ozone are removed and emission reflux is carried out in the room." (emphasis added). Hence, it is respectfully submitted that Hiromachi recites a room air pasteurizer and

does not recite or suggest:

A clothes dryer, comprising:

a chamber to accommodate clothes;

a first duct to supply air into the chamber;

a second duct to supply air into the chamber;

a heater to heat air supplied through at least one of the first or second ducts;

an ozonizer to automatically supply ozone into the chamber through at least

one of the first or second ducts **when an amount of odor of the clothes is**

greater than an odor reference value; and

an ozone disposer to selectively remove ozone from air recirculated into the chamber, (emphasis added)

as is recited in independent claim 8 of the present invention,

or

An apparatus for containing clothes, the apparatus comprising:

a chamber to accommodate clothes;

a heater to generate a current of warm air by heating air supplied into the chamber;

an ozonizer to supply ozone into the chamber;

an ozone disposer to selectively remove ozone from air recirculated into the chamber; and

a control unit to automatically control the heater and the ozonizer to periodically perform a drying function and a deodorizing function according to automatically detected amounts of moisture and odor, respectively, of the clothes, (emphasis added) as is recited in independent claim 13 of the present invention.

Hence, it is respectfully submitted that there is no recitation or suggestion of combining Hiromachi with Hachiman, and even if combined, the pneumatic sterilization device-deaeration drying machine does not recite or suggest the present claimed invention.

Hence, it is respectfully submitted that there is no recitation or suggestion of combining Hachiman et al. (Japanese patent publication No. 2002-85898) in view of Taylor et al. (USPN 6,312,507) or Sun et al. (USPN 6,447,731) and Watanabe (JP02-087175) or Hiromachi (JP 2002-282346), and that independent claims 8 and 13 of the present claimed invention are patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Hachiman et al. (Japanese patent publication No. 2002-85898) in view of Taylor et al. (USPN 6,312,507) or Sun et al. (USPN 6,447,731) and Watanabe (JP02-087175) or Hiromachi (JP 2002-282346).

B. In the Office Action, at pages 3-4, numbered paragraph 5, claims 14 and 16-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dhaemers (USPN 5,546,678; hereafter, Dhaemers) in view of Taylor et al. (USPN 6,312,507; hereafter, Taylor) or Sun et al. (USPN 6,447,731; hereafter, Sun) and Watanabe (JP02-087175; hereafter, Watanabe) or Hiromachi (JP 2002-282346; hereafter, Hiromachi). The reasons for the rejection are set forth in the Office Action and therefore not repeated. The rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

As suggested by the Examiner, claim 14 has been amended to recite the features of claims 16 and 19. Claims 16 and 19 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Hence, amended claim 14 is submitted to be in allowable form, and claim 14 is submitted to be patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Dhaemers (USPN 5,546,678) in view of Taylor et al. (USPN 6,312,507) or Sun et al. (USPN 6,447,731) and Watanabe (JP02-087175) or Hiromachi (JP 2002-282346), as indicated by the Examiner on page 7 of the Office Action.

Claim 18 has been amended to depend from amended claim 14. Since claims 17 and 18 depend from amended claim 14, claims 17 and 18 are submitted to be patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Dhaemers (USPN 5,546,678) in view of Taylor et al. (USPN 6,312,507) or Sun et al. (USPN 6,447,731) and Watanabe (JP02-087175) or Hiromachi (JP 2002-282346) for at least the reasons that amended claim 14 is patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Dhaemers (USPN 5,546,678) in view of Taylor et al. (USPN 6,312,507) or Sun et al. (USPN 6,447,731) and Watanabe (JP02-087175) or Hiromachi (JP 2002-282346).

C. In the Office Action, at pages 4-5, numbered paragraph 6, claim 29 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dhaemers (USPN 5,546,678; hereafter, Dhaemers) in view of Taylor et al. (USPN 6,312,507; hereafter, Taylor) or Sun et al. (USPN 6,447,731; hereafter, Sun) and Watanabe (JP02-087175; hereafter, Watanabe) or Hiromachi (JP 2002-282346; hereafter, Hiromachi) as applied to claim 16 above, and further in view of Eisen (USPN 5,940,988; hereafter, Eisen) or Ou (USPN 5,555,640; hereafter, Ou). The reasons for the rejection are set forth in the Office Action and therefore not repeated. The rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

As suggested by the Examiner, claim 14 has been amended to recite the features of claims 16 and 19. Claims 16 and 19 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Hence, amended claim 14 is submitted to be in allowable form as set forth by the Examiner on page 7 of the Office Action.

Claim 29 has been amended to depend from amended claim 14. Hence, amended claim 29 is submitted to be patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Dhaemers (USPN 5,546,678) in

view of Taylor et al. (USPN 6,312,507) or Sun et al. (USPN 6,447,731) and Watanabe (JP02-087175) or Hiromachi (JP 2002-282346) as applied to claim 16 above, and further in view of Eisen (USPN 5,940,988) or Ou (USPN 5,555,640), for at least the reasons that amended claim 14 is patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Dhaemers (USPN 5,546,678) in view of Taylor et al. (USPN 6,312,507) or Sun et al. (USPN 6,447,731) and Watanabe (JP02-087175) or Hiromachi (JP 2002-282346) as applied to claim 16 above, and further in view of Eisen (USPN 5,940,988) or Ou (USPN 5,555,640).

D. In the Office Action, at pages 5-6, numbered paragraph 7, claims 8-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ou (USPN 5,755,040; hereafter Ou) in view of Taylor et al. (USPN 6,312,507; hereafter, Taylor) or Sun et al. (USPN 6,447,731; hereafter, Sun) and Watanabe (JP02-087175; hereafter, Watanabe) or Hiromachi (JP 2002-282346; hereafter, Hiromachi). The reasons for the rejection are set forth in the Office Action and therefore not repeated. The rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

As noted above, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner has utilized hindsight reasoning, i.e., has utilized the present invention as a blueprint, listed the necessary elements using the blueprint, and then selected FIVE patents, each having an element of the present invention, and combined them to purport to show that the present invention is obvious. It should be noted that the courts have held that such an approach is not acceptable: In Ruiz and Foundation v. A.B. Chance Company, 69 USPQ2d 1690 (CAFC January 29, 2004), the court held:

In making the assessment of differences, section 103 specifically requires consideration of the claimed invention "as a whole." Inventions typically are new combinations of existing principles or features. Envtl. Designs, Ltd. v. Union Oil Co., 713 F.2d 693, 698 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (noting that "virtually all [inventions] are combinations of old elements."). The "as a whole" instruction in title 35 prevents evaluation of the invention part by part. **Without this important requirement, an obviousness assessment might break an invention into its component parts (A + B + C), then find a prior art reference containing A, another containing B, and another containing C, and on that basis alone declare the invention obvious. This form of hindsight reasoning, using the invention as a roadmap to find its prior art components, would discount the value of combining various existing features or principles in a new way to achieve a new result – often the very definition of invention.** (emphasis added)

Section 103 precludes this hindsight discounting of the value of new combinations by requiring assessment of the invention as a whole. This court has provided further assurance of an "as a whole" assessment of the invention under § 103 by requiring a showing that an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention, confronted by the same problems as the inventor and with no knowledge of the claimed invention, would select the various elements from the prior art and combine them in the claimed manner. In other words, the examiner or court must show some suggestion or motivation, before the invention itself, to make the new combination. See In re Rouffet, 149 F.3d 1350, 1355-56 (Fed. Cir. 1998). (emphasis added)

The Examiner admits that Ou does not show an ozonizer, an ozone disposer and a control unit for automatically controlling the ozonizer based on the detected odor. Ou recites a multipurpose household drying center.

It is respectfully submitted that Taylor recites (see Abstract): "A **hand-holdable electro-kinetic electro-static ionic air refreshener-conditioner for a pet shelter or litter box** includes a self-contained ion generator that provides electro-kinetically moved air with ions and safe amounts of ozone" (emphasis added). Hence, it is respectfully submitted that Taylor recites an air refreshener-conditioner for a pet litter box or the like and does not recite or suggest:

A clothes dryer, comprising:

a chamber to accommodate clothes;

a first duct to supply air into the chamber;

a second duct to supply air into the chamber;

a heater to heat air supplied through at least one of the first or second ducts;

an ozonizer to automatically supply ozone into the chamber through at least one of the first or second ducts **when an amount of odor of the clothes is**

greater than an odor reference value; and

an ozone disposer to selectively remove ozone from air recirculated into the chamber, (emphasis added)

as is recited in independent claim 8 of the present invention.

Hence, it is respectfully submitted that there is no recitation or suggestion of combining Taylor with Ou, and even if combined, the pet-litter box air refreshener conditioner -multipurpose household drying center does not recite or suggest the present claimed invention.

It is respectfully submitted that Sun recites (see col. 1, lines 4-8 of Sun): "The present invention relates to **a cleaning device which can be connected with a personal computer to serve as an environmental quality monitoring system which is able to automatically judge and adjust indoor air quality,** and give more information for a user" (emphasis added). Hence, it is respectfully submitted that Sun recites an air quality adjustment system which is attachable to a computer and does not recite or suggest:

A clothes dryer, comprising:

a chamber to accommodate clothes;

a first duct to supply air into the chamber;

a second duct to supply air into the chamber;

a heater to heat air supplied through at least one of the first or second ducts;

an ozonizer to automatically supply ozone into the chamber through at least one of the first or second ducts when an amount of odor of the clothes is greater than an odor reference value; and
an ozone disposer to selectively remove ozone from air recirculated into the chamber, (emphasis added)
as is recited in independent claim 8 of the present invention.

Hence, it is respectfully submitted that there is no recitation or suggestion of combining Sun with Ou, and even if combined, the personal computer cleaning device-multipurpose household drying center does not recite or suggest the present claimed invention.

It is respectfully submitted that Watanabe recites (see (57) Abstract and BASIC ABSTRACT): a unit having an ozone filter wherein the unit is "Used in electrophotographic image forming units including printers, copying machines, or facsimiles" (emphasis added). Hence, it is respectfully submitted that Watanabe recites an ozone filter for image forming units and does not recite or suggest:

A clothes dryer, comprising:

a chamber to accommodate clothes;
a first duct to supply air into the chamber;
a second duct to supply air of into the chamber;
a heater to heat air supplied through at least one of the first or second ducts;
an ozonizer to automatically supply ozone into the chamber through at least one of the first or second ducts when an amount of odor of the clothes is greater than an odor reference value; and
an ozone disposer to selectively remove ozone from air recirculated into the chamber, (emphasis added)
as is recited in independent claim 8 of the present invention.

Hence, it is respectfully submitted that there is no recitation or suggestion of combining Watanabe with Ou, and even if combined, the unit having an ozone filter used in an electrophotographic image forming unit-multipurpose household drying center does not recite or suggest the present claimed invention.

It is respectfully submitted that Hiromachi recites (see CORRECTION OR AMENDMENT, February 12, 2003, a copy of which is included herewith for the Examiner's convenience):

"[Claim 1] From some receipt objects which sterilize air, air is incorporated and the inside of the "sterilization tank" (drawing 5 -19) of the following conditions and a "sterilization wind tunnel"

(drawing 5 -20) is passed for the incorporated air. The inactivation of the virus in air, Sterilization, dust removing, odor removal, etc. are performed and it is the air pasteurizer of structure which returns to the room the air which it was humidified in the case of dry air, and resulted in the last "finishing wind tunnel" (drawing 5 -20), and superfluous waterdrop and superfluous surplus ozone were removed, and was purified with the ozone air current of optimum dose further. The conditions in a sterilization tank and a sterilization wind tunnel are the environments which gestalt-ized ozone to some. The air to which opening of the opening of the air which drew in with inhalation opening first is carried out in the shower cylinder of the water surface (drawing 51) where the air bubbles containing ozone have exploded and which passed through the shower cylinder further passes the multistage type ozone water network (drawing 7) which passes the environment where ozone gas and an ozone water droplet are flying, and is always further washed with ozone water, and measures air, ozone water, and mixed contact. It results in a "finishing wind tunnel" (drawing 43) after that, and by passing a waterdrop prehension filter (drawing 54), an ozone reduction filter (drawing 52, 3), etc., superfluous moisture and surplus ozone are removed and emission reflux is carried out in the room." (emphasis added). Hence, it is respectfully submitted that Hiromachi recites a room air pasteurizer and does not recite or suggest:

A clothes dryer, comprising:

a chamber to accommodate clothes;

a first duct to supply air into the chamber;

a second duct to supply air into the chamber;

a heater to heat air supplied through at least one of the first or second ducts;

an ozonizer to automatically supply ozone into the chamber through at least one of the first or second ducts when an amount of odor of the clothes is greater than an odor reference value; and

an ozone disposer to selectively remove ozone from air recirculated into the chamber, (emphasis added)

as is recited in independent claim 8 of the present invention.

Hence, it is respectfully submitted that there is no recitation or suggestion of combining Hiromachi with Ou, and even if combined, the pneumatic sterilization device-multipurpose household drying center does not recite or suggest the present claimed invention.

Hence, it is respectfully submitted that there is to recitation or suggestion of combining Ou (USPN 5,755,040) in view of Taylor et al. (USPN 6,312,507) or Sun et al. (USPN 6,447,731) and Watanabe (JP02-087175) or Hiromachi (JP 2002-282346), and that independent claim 8 of

the present claimed invention is patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Ou (USPN 5,755,040) in view of Taylor et al. (USPN 6,312,507) or Sun et al. (USPN 6,447,731) and Watanabe (JP02-087175) or Hiromachi (JP 2002-282346).

Since claims 9-12 depend from claim 8 of the present invention, claims 9-12 are submitted to be patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Ou (USPN 5,755,040) in view of Taylor et al. (USPN 6,312,507) or Sun et al. (USPN 6,447,731) and Watanabe (JP02-087175) or Hiromachi (JP 2002-282346) for at least the reasons that claim 8 is patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Ou (USPN 5,755,040) in view of Taylor et al. (USPN 6,312,507) or Sun et al. (USPN 6,447,731) and Watanabe (JP02-087175) or Hiromachi (JP 2002-282346).

E. In the Office Action, at pages 6-7, numbered paragraph 8, claims 14, 16-18, and 25-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ou (USPN 5,755,040; hereafter Ou) in view of Dhaemers (USPN 5,546,678; hereafter, Dhaemers) and Taylor et al. (USPN 6,312,507; hereafter, Taylor) or Sun et al. (USPN 6,447,731; hereafter, Sun) and Watanabe (JP02-087175; hereafter, Watanabe) or Hiromachi (JP 2002-282346; hereafter, Hiromachi). The reasons for the rejection are set forth in the Office Action and therefore not repeated. The rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

As suggested by the Examiner, claim 14 has been amended to recite the features of claims 16 and 19. Claims 16 and 19 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Hence, amended claim 14 is submitted to be in allowable form, and claim 14 is submitted to be patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Ou (USPN 5,755,040) in view of Dhaemers (USPN 5,546,678) and Taylor et al. (USPN 6,312,507) or Sun et al. (USPN 6,447,731) and Watanabe (JP02-087175) or Hiromachi (JP 2002-282346) is now moot.

Claims 18, 20, 25 and 29 have been amended to depend from amended claim 14. Since claims 17, 18 and 25-29 depend from amended claim 14, claims 17-18 and 25-29 are submitted to be patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Ou (USPN 5,755,040) in view of Dhaemers (USPN 5,546,678) and Taylor et al. (USPN 6,312,507) or Sun et al. (USPN 6,447,731) and Watanabe (JP02-087175) or Hiromachi (JP 2002-282346) for at least the reasons that amended claim 14 is patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Ou (USPN 5,755,040) in view of Dhaemers (USPN 5,546,678) and Taylor et al. (USPN 6,312,507) or Sun et al. (USPN 6,447,731) and Watanabe (JP02-087175) or Hiromachi (JP 2002-282346).

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER:

Claims 19-24 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicants thank the Examiner for his careful review of the claims and indication that claims 19-24 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 14 has been amended to recite the features of claims 16 and 19. Claims 16 and 19 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Hence, amended claim 14 is submitted to be in allowable form. Claims 18, 20, 25 and 29 have been amended to depend from amended claim 14. Since claims 18 and 20-29 depend from amended claim 14, claims 18 and 20-29 are submitted to be in allowable form for at least the reasons that amended claim 14 is in allowable form.

CONCLUSION:

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot, and further, that all pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. Thus, there being no further outstanding objections or rejections, the application is submitted as being in condition for allowance which action is earnestly solicited. At a minimum, this Amendment should be entered at least for purposes of Appeal as it either clarifies and/or narrows the issues for consideration by the Board.

If the Examiner has any remaining issues to be addressed, it is believed that prosecution can be expedited and possibly concluded by the Examiner contacting the undersigned attorney for a telephone interview to discuss any such remaining issues.

If there are any underpayments or overpayments of fees associated with the filing of this Amendment, please charge and/or credit the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: February 24, 2006

By: Darleen J. Stockley
Darleen J. Stockley
Registration No. 34,257

1201 New York Avenue, N.W.
Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501